UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,648	10/14/2005	Junbiao Zhang	PU030121	5569

24498   7590   12/17/2010
Robert D. Shedd, Patent Operations
THOMSON Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER
MILLER, BRANDON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/17/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _15 November 2010_.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1,5-9 and 12-16_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1,5-9 and 12-16_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _14 October 2005_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment/Remarks

Disposition of Claims

I.   Claims 1, 5-9, and 12-16 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459

(1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness
         or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

     II.   Claims 1, 5-6, 9, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Prasad (US 7,515,569 B2) in view of Hopprich et al. (US 6,792,474 B1).

     Regarding claim 1 Prasad teaches a method for offering wireless network access to both

guests and local users (see col. 1, lines 6-8 and col. 3, lines 48-55). Prasad teaches sending a

guest credential (profile) to a guest user (see col. 4, lines 1-17 & 60-63). Prasad teaches

receiving at a common wireless access point a request for access (association request) from one

of a guest and local user, said request for access from said guest user including said guest

credential (see col. 5, lines 11-16). Prasad teaches determining (checking) at the wireless

network access point whether the access request was received from local user or guest (see col.

5, lines 16-20). Prasad teaches authenticating the request for access received at the common

access point depending on whether the request was received from the guest or local user (see col.

5, lines 23-27), wherein the authentication step further comprises the step of communicating a

request for authentication to one or more authentication servers, the authentication being

performed differently depending on whether the party seeking access is a local user or a guest

(see col. 4, lines 51-60). Prasad teaches if such authentication is successful, then routing traffic

from the local user differently from the guest; and limiting traffic from said guest according to a

guest access policy (see col. 3, lines 49-55 and col. 5, lines 18-20 & 23-27).

     Prasad does not specifically teach the determining including examining a user domain

received from a party seeking access to determine whether such user domain designates a guest

domain.

Hopprich teaches determining including examining a user domain received from a party

seeking access (110, FIG. 1) to determine whether such user domain designates a guest domain

(see col. 23, lines 17-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to make the determining in Prasad adapt to include examining a user domain received

from a party seeking access to determine whether such user domain designates a guest domain

because it would allow for a robust authentication and verification technique for local and guest

users requesting access (see Hopprich, col. 4, lines 56-62).

Regarding claim 5 Prasad teaches wherein the authenticating step further comprises the

step of communicating a request for authentication to a single authentication server which

performs authentication using different credentials (profiles) for local users and guests (see col.

4, lines 10-17 & 51-60).

Regarding claim 6 Prasad teaches ascertaining whether the request for access was

received in an IEEE 802.1x format (see col. 1, lines 29-34; col. 5, lines 18-20; col. 7, lines 11-13

and Table 1).

Regarding claim 9 Prasad teaches a wireless local area network for offering wireless

network access to both guest and local users (see col. 1, lines 6-8 and col. 3, lines 10-19 & 48-

55). Prasad teaches at least one common wireless network access point offering access to both

guests and local users in response to a request for access (see col. 5, lines 11-16). Prasad teaches

the access point sending a guest credential (profile) to a guest user (see col. 4, lines 1-17 & 60-

63). Prasad teaches the access point receiving at a common wireless network access point a

request for access (association request) from one of a guest and local user, wherein said request

for access from said guest user including said guest credential (see col. 5, lines 11-16). Prasad teaches the access point determining (checking) whether the access request was received form a local user or a guest (see col. 5, lines 16-20). Prasad teaches the access point communicating a request for authentication to at least one server (see col. 4, lines 51-60). Prasad teaches the at least one server coupled to the at least one wireless network access point for authenticating the request for access differently depending on whether the request was received from the guest or local user, and the at least one server also for receiving the request for authentication (see col. 4, lines 51-60). Prasad teaches means coupled to the at least one wireless LAN access point for routing traffic from the local user differently from the guest; and means for limiting traffic from said guest according to a guest access policy (see col. 3, lines 49-55 and col. 5, lines 18-20 & 23-27).

Prasad does not specifically teach the determining including examining if user domain received with the access request indicates a guest domain.

Hopprich teaches examining if user domain received with the access request indicates a guest domain (see col. 23, lines 17-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the determining in Prasad adapt to include examining if user domain received with the access request indicates a guest domain because it would allow for a robust authentication and verification technique for local and guest users requesting access (see Hopprich, col. 4, lines 56-62).

Regarding claim 12 Prasad and Hopprich teach limitations as recited in claim 5 and therefore claim 12 is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

III.   Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prasad
(US 7,515,569 B2) in view of Hopprich et al. (US 6,792,474 B1) and Liu et al. (US 7,177,637
B2).

Regarding claim 7 Prasad and Hopprich teach the method according to claim 1 wherein
the routing step further comprises the step of routing traffic from a guest to an external network.

Prasad does teach routing traffic from a guest differently (see col. 3, lines 50-56).

Liu teaches routing traffic from a guest to an external network (see col. 4, lines 4-8 & 28-
30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention
was made to make the routing in the Prasad and Hopprich combination adapt to include routing
traffic from a guest to an external network because this would provide the appropriate amount of
limited access for guest users (see Liu, col. 3, liens 1-7).

Regarding claim 8 Prasad and Hopprich teach the method according to claim 1 wherein
the routing step further comprises the step of routing traffic from a local user to a corporate
intranet.

Prasad does teach routing traffic from a full access user differently (see col. 3, lines 50-
56).

Liu teaches routing traffic from a local user to a corporate intranet (see col. 3, lines 50-
53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention
was made to make the routing in the Prasad and Hopprich combination adapt to include routing

traffic from a local user to a corporate intranet because this would provide the appropriate

amount of access for full access users (see Liu, col. 3, liens 8-11).

    IV.   Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Prasad (US 7,515,569 B2) in view of Hopprich et al. (US 6,792,474 B1) and Anton, Jr. (US

2002/0157090 A1).

    Regarding claim 13 Prasad and Hopprich teach the network according to claim 9 except

for wherein the at least one wireless network access point ascertains whether the request for

access was received in an IEEE 802.1x format or was received in a web-browser format.

    Prasad does teach wherein the at least one wireless network access point ascertains

whether the request for access was received in an IEEE 802.1x format (see col. 1, lines 29-34;

col. 5, lines 18-20; col. 7, lines 11-13 and Table 1).

    Anton, Jr. teaches a request for access received in a web-browser format (see paragraph

[0026]).

    It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to make the access point in the Prasad and Hopprich combination adapt to include

ascertaining whether the request for access was received in an IEEE 802.1x format or was

received in a web-browser format because the access point in the Prasad and Hopprich

combination can determine the format of the request for access by analyzing the profile format

(see Prasad, col. 7, lines 10-13) it would allow for an efficient way to accurately identify guest

users (see Anton, Jr., bottom of paragraph [0025]).

Regarding claim 14 Prasad and Hopprich teach the network according to claim 9 except for wherein the means for routing traffic includes a firewall.

Anton, Jr. teaches means for routing traffic that includes a firewall (see paragraph [0024]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the means for routing in the Prasad and Hopprich combination adapt to include a firewall because it would allow network which provides a secure environment for network access (see Anton, Jr., paragraph [0022]).

Regarding claim 15 Prasad and Hopprich teach the method according to claim 6 except for providing web browser based authentication if the request for access was not received in the IEEE 802.1x format.

Prasad does teach wherein the at least one wireless network access point ascertains whether the request for access was received in an IEEE 802.1x format (see col. 1, lines 29-34; col. 5, lines 18-20; col. 7, lines 11-13 and Table 1).

Anton, Jr. teaches providing web browser based authentication (see paragraph [0023]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the authentication in the Prasad and Hopprich combination adapt to include providing web browser based authentication if the request for access was not received in the IEEE 802.1x format because it would allow for an efficient and desirable way to authenticate a guest user (see Anton, Jr., bottom of pg. 3, paragraphs [0026] & [0027]).

Regarding claim 16 Liu and Hopprich teach limitations as recited in claim 15 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Claim Objections

V.   Claims 1 and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1

recites "a common wireless network access point" in line 4; "the wireless network access point"

in line 6; and "the common access point" in line 9. It would be more clarifying if the term used

to reference the access point in lines 4, 6, and 9 were more consistent throughout the claim.

Claim 9 contains similar inconsistencies regarding the terminology used for the access

point and it is objected to for the same reasoning given above.

Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments

VI.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5-9, and 12-16 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

VII.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Wu et al. Pub. No.: US 2004/0203783 A1 discloses a wireless network handoff key.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to BRANDON J. MILLER whose telephone number is (571)272-

7869. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Eng/   /Brandon J Miller/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617   Examiner, Art Unit 2617